

# Office of Current Production and Analytic Support

## CIA Operations Center

T9560

Fri Jan 29 15:58:33 1988

Page 1

### News Bulletin

1749

-treaty

Fri Jan 29 15:51:00 1988

sked 1-29 0755

By ELIOT BRENNER

WASHINGTON (UPI)

Former NATO commander Bernard Rogers sharply criticized the INF treaty Friday, saying it gives up the one weapon Moscow fears most and could make Europe safe for conventional war.

But the retired Army general, who spent an unprecedented eight years as the top NATO commander, predicted the medium-range missile pact will be approved by the Senate. In its wake, he said, NATO must improve its battlefield-range nuclear forces, upgrade conventional forces and seek sharp reductions in Warsaw Pact conventional forces. And, he said, the superpowers should agree to cut by half the size of their strategic nuclear arsenals.

Rogers, who will testify Monday to the Senate Armed Services Committee, said the treaty returns the alliance to its pre-1979 position of relying on F-111 bombers to deliver nuclear weapons into the Soviet homeland. Those planes, he said, must be refueled amid an air war over Europe, and then run through a formidable Warsaw Pact and Soviet air defense system to hit their targets.

The treaty eliminates all U.S. and Soviet missiles with ranges from 300 to 3,400 miles, taking the Pershing-2 and ground-launched cruise missiles out of the U.S. inventory. Moscow would junk six missile types.

This treaty puts Western Europe on the slippery slope of denuclearization, which is something the Soviets want because it would make Europe safe for conventional war, Rogers told a National Press Club luncheon.

Treaty hearings continued on Capitol Hill Friday, and Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., again raised his now-familiar complaints about the accord. Former U.N. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick and former Defense Secretary Harold Brown both endorsed the treaty, with reservations. And the Intelligence Committee took closed-door testimony from Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci and Adm. James Crowe, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Rogers said Moscow fears the U.S. Pershing-2 missile because it can hit targets on Soviet soil in just 13 minutes, a weapon that if used to escalate a conventional war would inflict devastating damage to military targets in the Soviet Union rather than confining battle to NATO areas.

The remaining roughly 4,000 tactical weapons, he said, must be improved.

'I don't believe the residual 4,000 warheads (with existing delivery systems) will conjure up this perception of pain in the Soviets mind and keep the credibility of our deterrent high. ... The real question is will NATO retain the kinds of weapons platforms that will propel nuclear warheads onto militarily significant Soviet targets, and do the Soviets know that we can do that following this treaty. The answer is no,' said Rogers, noting that few of the 4,000 weapons could reach Soviet soil.

Despite his complaints about the treaty, Rogers praised some of its features of on-site verification and unequal reductions in warheads and missiles. And, he said, 'it proved that if NATO negotiates from a position of strength, will and resolved unity, it can get serious

STAT

# Office of Current Production and Analytic Support

## CIA Operations Center

T9560

Fri Jan 29 15:58:33 1988

Page 2

### News Bulletin

negotiations from the other side."

Kirkpatrick told the Armed Services Committee she favors the accord even though it "on balance leaves Europe somewhat more vulnerable, the Soviet Union somewhat less vulnerable and the alliance somewhat weaker."

Kirkpatrick, a leading conservative hard-liner, said rejection of the treaty would harm NATO governments that went "out on a limb" for it and would portray the U.S. government as in "serious disarray, incapable of pursuing a coherent policy."

However, she said the Senate should add to the treaty a provision that if Moscow does not comply with the treaty, the United States would terminate the agreement.

Brown, who served under President Carter and now runs the Johns Hopkins Foreign Policy Institute, told the military panel he would have preferred a treaty that let both sides keep some missiles. But overall, he said, the deal benefits the United States militarily and politically.

Brown said the treaty was "a modest but useful step" in removing weapons that were "significant in political terms" but militarily "a side show" to the issue of longer-range strategic nuclear weapons.

upi 01-29-88 03:56 pes